

A

# FRIENDLY ADDRESS,

OFFERED TO

THE SERIOUS CONSIDERATION OF THE  
ENGLISH ORDAINED EPISCOPAL CLERGY  
IN THE DIOCESS OF EDINBURGH,  
AND THEIR HEARERS.

WHEREIN ARE

STRICTURES on SCHISM and HERESY,

IN ANSWER TO

THE REV. PRINCIPAL CAMPBELL'S DISSERTATIONS ON  
THESE SUBJECTS.

BY THE RIGHT REVEREND  
DR ABERNETHY DRUMMOND.

---

*Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for  
your souls, as they that must give account, Heb. xiii. 17.*

---

EDINBURGH:

PRINTED IN THE YEAR 1789.

1608/2956.



## P R E F A C E.

**A**LTHOUGH I have the testimony of the learned Bishop of Worcester, that the following Address is written in the true pastoral spirit, and of the good Bishop of Carlisle, that it is an excellent Pamphlet, (as may be seen from their letters, which are in the hands of the Publisher); and therefore have no reason either to suspect the strength of my arguments, or that my mode of offering them to the public is calculated to give offence; yet, this notwithstanding, I am not very sanguine in my expectation of success; because I am far from being certain, that they will be read without prejudice. For experience has long shown, that an unbiassed mind is necessary to open mens eyes to the acknowledgement of the truth; and that the success of the best doctrine always depends more upon the temper of the people to whom it is proposed, than upon the goodness of the principles, or the strength and clearness of the arguments. by which it is supported. Our blessed Saviour certainly taught the purest doctrine, because he revealed the truths of God; and we are sure that he enforced them with the most powerful arguments, because he spake as never man spake, and had hid in him all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge: yet, but a few of his countrymen, comparatively speaking, became his converts. For though he came to his own, his own received him not: And they refused to hear the voice of the charmer, charmed he never so wisely. The reason was, they were prejudiced against his person, and therefore rejected his doctrine without examination;

and as the same cause, while men are men, will in every age, and in every country, always produce the same effect, it is much to be feared, that it still operates against men of my description. For the young people to whom I address myself have never, in all probability, been taught the duty of obeying those who ought to rule over them, and watch for their souls; because it has never been supposed, that the friends of Government in this country had any connection with spiritual Governors. or Bishops. At least, they have never been taught to enquire, whether they who claim the government of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, have a clear *ecclesiastical* right to that sacred office or not: On the contrary, because they have not been nominated by the King, it has been taken for granted, that they have no such right; and of consequence, they have been condemned without a hearing. That this is rather hard measure, every candid man must allow. However, that the present Scotch Bishops, being the real and true successors of the ante-revolution Bishops of this Church, have a right to spiritual jurisdiction is clearly, I think, proved, in some of the first pages of the following Address; and, to strengthen what is there said, I beg leave to add here, that if a *consecration* is necessary to constitute a *rightful* Bishop, the consequence would be, that there is not one rightful Bishop or Presbyter at this day in the whole world. For, since no church-officer had the King's or supreme magistrate's authority at first, but all preached, and ordained, in direct opposition to the commands of the State, the apostolical power of consecrating Bishops, and ordaining Priests, must have been lost as soon as it was obtained: and once lost, it could not possibly be recovered without a new commission from Heaven, which has never yet been given. To say, therefore, that one cannot be a rightful Bishop, or have *spiritual* authority, without the King's commission, is to say too much, because it unhinges all the Churches in the Christian world. Yet this is the sole pretence for denying spiritual jurisdiction

to



to the Scotch Bishops; and the true cause probably, why the young people whom I address, have never once thought of examining their claim to it. The aged people, on the other hand, to whom I now apply myself, though most of them were educated in the communion of our Church, were confirmed by her Bishops, and taught at first to reverence them who were over them in the Lord, and to esteem them highly in love, for their works sake; yet, having long ago prevailed upon themselves, on worldly considerations, to forsake their first love, and to join in worship with those who found it profitable, and therefore convenient, to set up altar against altar, they have, by length of time, lost all sense of duty to the regular successors of their former Pastors and see not the danger, which St Paul warns against, of heaping up to themselves *new* teachers, having itching ears. Just as people who abstain from public worship, though at first they feel uneasiness, yet, being persuaded by ill advice, or overcome by ill example, to persevere in that pernicious practice, at length lose their sensibility of heart, and forget that they are under any obligation to attend divine service at all; and so continue to live as without God in the world. Another thing which may prevent the success of this Address, is, that it will probably be represented as a species of controversy; and controversy in this age is so odious a thing, that it is commonly reprobated, and laid aside at first sight. But, my Brethren, it ought not thus to be. For there is no coming at the knowledge of the truth, without detecting the errors of those who endeavour to pervert it; and therefore, though we may often have reason to disapprove of the *mode* of carrying on controversy, yet, when the point disputed is a matter of consequence, we ought not to condemn the *thing*. Against what I have urged, I know it will be said, Since my hopes of success are so little, why take the trouble to write, and publish this Pamphlet? To which I answer, that I may exoner my conscience, and discharge the part of a faithful and true Pastor. God commands his Prophet

phet to cry aloud, and spare not ; to lift up his voice like a trumpet, and shew his people their transgressions, and the house of Jacob their sins ; and that, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear. And he threatens the watchman who does not warn the people to turn from their iniquities, that if they die in their sins their blood will be required at *his* hands. In conformity to which, St Paul and Barnabas, though they probably foresaw that the Jews of Antioch and Pisidia would reject the doctrine of the gospel, yet still they thought it their duty to make them an offer of the divine word, before they turned to the Gentiles. Now these commands, and this example, I believe to be obligatory upon all Christian Bishops at this day ; and therefore, in obedience thereto, I presume, once for all, to present this Address ; assuring those who are concerned in it, that I shall never again trouble them on this subject, unless I am called upon by an attack to defend the principles which I have here laid down. My mind is open to conviction : and if I am in the wrong, I call upon my Reverend Brethren in the opposition to show where my error lies. Charity to me, and justice to themselves, demand this of them ; and if they can shew from Scripture, Christian antiquity ; or by the testimony of the approved Divines of the Church of England, that it is lawful for Presbyters to gather congregations and officiate to them, without the authority of the Bishop of the diocese wherein they live, when no sinful terms of communion are required of them, I shall yield up the cause. But if they fail in their proof, and I strongly suspect they will fail, then I hope they will consider it to be their duty, to unite with the Episcopal Church in this country, and so become, with us, one fold, under the ONE SHEPHERD.



*A FRIENDLY ADDRESS, offered to the serious Consideration of the English Ordained Episcopal Clergy in the Diocese of Edinburgh, and their Hearers.*

---

REVEREND AND HONOURABLE,

WHEN St Paul preached to the people of Athens Jesus and the resurrection, St Luke tells, Acts, xvii. 18. that he was accosted by some philosophers in this rude language,—What will the babbler say? But, my Brethren, however you may differ from me on the subject of this letter, or whether it shall operate on your minds the conviction I wish for, or not, I am persuaded better things of you, than that you will thus reproach me. Some of you are Christian clergymen; all of you are believers in our Lord: And as you must be sensible, that to confess the doctrine and submit to the discipline and government of Christ's Church is the duty of all his followers, you will therefore give a patient hearing to what I shall communicate in his name, and by his authority; and so, will not reckon me your enemy because I tell you the truth; especially as I shall endeavour to address you, not only in the spirit of meekness, but of love. My intention is, to persuade you, if I can, to become members of that Church whereof I have the honour to be a Governor; and from which, in my judgement, you have been too long separated: a Church apostolical in its doctrine, worship, and government, and of consequence a pure and sound part of Christ's Catholic Church, in communion with which you may certainly save your souls. If in this I shall be so happy as succeed, we will then dwell together in unity, and all discord and contention cease. But whether I succeed or not, the design you will allow is laudable; because till our divisions be at an end, the Scotch Episcopal Church, it is apparent, can never flourish, nor indeed true religion prosper among us.

To begin then: You profess yourselves, my brethren, to be members of an Episcopal society; and as such, you will admit, that you ought to have a relation to

some spiritual superior ; because you must know, that Episcopal congregations without a Bishop are a body without a head ; an object that rarely, if ever, appears in nature, and surely ought never to be seen in the Christian Church. Now, my brethren, let me ask you without offence, to what diocese you belong ? and who the person is whose spiritual jurisdiction you submit to ? And, that you may be enabled to answer these questions the more accurately, give me leave to put another : When St Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, xiii. 17. commands the Jewish Christians in these words, " Obey them that have the rule over you, " and submit yourselves ; for they watch for your souls, " as they that must give an account ; " what Bishop was it that the Apostle meant they should obey ? For that he spoke of ecclesiastical governors only, is obvious, because none but such watch for mens souls. Now, if there was then a proper Bishop of Jerusalem, as tradition says there was, could the Apostle mean, that the inhabitants of the Holy City should apply to the Bishops of Rome, or Corinth, Antioch, or Alexandria, for Episcopal offices, and not to St Simeon, or whoever was the Bishop of the place ? Surely not. Because for no other reason could a Bishop be settled in Jerusalem, but that he might preside over the affairs of the Church there, and perform the offices which were peculiar to his high station ; and none but one in the city, or near it, could with equal facility and advantage watch for the peoples souls. But what proves incontestibly that the Bishop or Bishops in Palestine were in St Paul's eye when he gave the above command, is this, that no other Bishop could have lawfully interfered in opposition to them, without introducing disorder into the Church of God. Did you see the Sheriff of one county authorised to act in another in opposition to its proper magistrate, you would immediately perceive the mischief and miserable consequences of jarring jurisdictions ; and would be sensible, not only of the wisdom and propriety, but even the necessity, for the sake of peace, of confining the exercise of every officer's authority, ecclesiastical as well as civil, within certain limits or districts, that so order may be preserved, and the affairs of church and state not run into confusion. I say the affairs of the *Church*, as well as of the State : For it cannot be denied, that regularity is at least as needful in the government of *Christ's kingdom*, as in the kingdoms of this world. And therefore you must admit, that God, who is a God of order, not of confusion, and  
who





who has commanded all things in his Church to be done decently and in order, cannot possibly authorise clashing jurisdictions, or any Bishop to interfere in the diocese of another lawful Bishop without his permission.

And here another question, and a very important one, occurs:—Is there at this time a *lawful* Bishop in Edinburgh? By *lawful*, I mean a regularly ordained, and a canonically elected Bishop, agreeable to the rules of the Catholic Church, and of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. For surely you will not contend, that the authority of the civil magistrate is necessary to constitute a lawful Bishop; or, that a Bishop cannot have *spiritual jurisdiction* over the people in a diocese without the King's authority; because, if so, it would follow, that there was not *one lawful* Bishop in any part of the Church of God for more than 300 years after Christ; or not one ecclesiastical officer who had authority from Christ to preside over his spiritual kingdom all that time: because you know there were none of them who had the countenance of the Roman Emperors, the *then* civil power. But to advance so strange a position would be as false as it is wild; and therefore will not, I am persuaded, my brethren, be insisted upon by any of you. And if not, then you must grant, that as of old throughout the Roman Empire, so now in Scotland, there may be lawful Bishops, and the members of the Church residing there be in conscience bound to submit to their spiritual jurisdiction, although these Bishops have not the sanction of legal authority, or a settlement by act of Parliament. This was acknowledged by the twenty-two Bishops of the Church of England who voted against the penal statute passed against the Church of Scotland, Ann. 1748; and particularly was well defended by the then Bishop of Oxford, the learned and pious Dr Secker, who thus expressed himself: “To preserve the Episcopal Church in Scotland, the Bishops who were outed of their temporalities at the Revolution, not only conferred orders, but consecrated Bishops in the room of those that died: for surely the Episcopal party in Scotland have as much a right and a power to both the one and the other, as the primitive Christians had before their religion came to be the established religion of any country,” &c. \* Now this being granted,—that there is at present a Bishop of Edinburgh, and others in this kingdom, deriving their succession from the ante-revolution Bishops, who were in full communion with the then Church of England, can hardly be questioned by any of you, Gentlemen;

\* See Scots Magazine for the year 1748, p. 589.



Gentlemen ; as the fact must be in some measure known to many of your communion, the elderly people especially. Indeed I may say, it has in part been transacted before your eyes ; there having always been persons in that sacred character in Edinburgh, and several of them proper Bishops of the place, since the death of Dr Rose, the ejected Bishop at the Revolution. For to him succeeded Bishop Fullarton, to him Bishop Millar, Bishop Lumsden, Bishop Freebairn, Bishop Falconar : and besides them resided here, Bishop Cant, Bishop Gillan, Bishop Keith ; and who it is that fills the see of Edinburgh just now, however unworthily, I need not say. Suffice it to observe, that since Bishops may have spiritual jurisdiction, and so both presbyters and people be bound to submit to them as their rulers, though they have not legal authority from the supreme power, if the Church of England was a pure and sound Church *before* the Revolution, which you cannot deny, ours could not be an impure one after that period ; because she continued to maintain the same principles after she lost the countenance of the civil magistrate, which the Church of England held before the arrival of the Prince of Orange, when you must admit she was a true and orthodox part of Christ's Mystical Body.

The sum of what I have said on this head is this, That since all the Bishops in the world preached, administered sacraments, and governed their respective dioceses for more than 300 years, and in short were universally acknowledged to be *lawful* Bishops, and to have *spiritual jurisdiction* over their flocks, although they acted in direct opposition to the supreme civil power, the Scots Bishops could not lose their spiritual authority over the people of this country, merely by being deprived of the countenance of the civil magistrate at the Revolution ; but, as they have held from that period downwards, and still do hold, the same orthodox faith as the Church of England, and have preserved the Episcopal succession regularly to this day ; therefore they all along have been, and now are, as *lawful* Bishops in the ecclesiastical sense of the word, as any in the world : Consequently they must have Divine authority for the exercise of their sacred ministry, as much as any other Bishops either in England or Ireland. So some of your clergy have of late acknowledged to me, and these neither the weakest nor the worst men ; and the belief of it among your laity is confirmed, by the constant application which has been, from time to time, made to our Bishops for the holy ordinance of confirmation by those of your communion. Yet, my brethren,

thren, is it not a fact, that you officiate without the authority of these lawful Bishops? and is not that a dreadful consideration? Is it possible that God, who is a God of order, not of confusion, can authorise the Bishop of Edinburgh, for example, to be the supreme governor in this diocese, and at the same time give the inferior clergy liberty to act in opposition to him? Surely not. If God is true, both cannot have his authority. But that the *Bishop* is authorised by God, if the succession in this country is preserved, all sensible Episcopalians must confess; and is not the conclusion lamentable? Think of it for God's sake, and now at last come over to the Church from which you have been too long estranged. Every day you repeat the Litany, you pray to God to deliver you from schism, which proves it to be a sin, otherwise your prayer would be a mockery of Heaven, of which you are incapable. Now schism, you know, is a separation from any pure part of the Church of God, when no sinful term of communion is required. And by our Church no sinful term is required; nor is there any obstacle to hinder you from acknowledging the spiritual authority of her governors. On the contrary, by our praying for his Majesty, the only shadow of an argument that was against us, is now removed. And as you are in full communion with the Church of England, and were you in that country, would think yourselves obliged to communicate with the Bishop of the diocese wherein you happened to live; therefore, however mercifully God may deal with conscientious dissenters, who believe it unlawful to join in communion with a Bishop, you, who see no just cause for withdrawing from it, must think *them* in a state of schism. Now, if it be schism in *England*, to separate from the communion of the lawful Bishop of the diocese, when he requires no sinful term of compliance, must not a separation from the communion of the lawful Bishop of the diocese be schism in *Scotland*, when no sinful term is required by him? Surely what is sinful, or what you would think wrong on the one side of the Tweed, cannot be consistent with Church unity, nor be innocent upon the other, all material circumstances being the same.

Consider this also, my Reverend and Honourable Friends, and do not persist in the daily practice of schism, when you are daily praying against it; for that will be a most tremendous piece of business, because, as I have already said, a most solemn affront to Almighty God.

Farther, consider that mere ordination does not make a  
clergyman

Gentlemen ; as the fact must be in some measure known to many of your communion, the elderly people especially. Indeed I may say, it has in part been transacted before your eyes ; there having always been persons in that sacred character in Edinburgh, and several of them proper Bishops of the place, since the death of Dr Rose, the ejected Bishop at the Revolution. For to him succeeded Bishop Fullarton, to him Bishop Millar, Bishop Lumsden, Bishop Freebairn, Bishop Falconar : and besides them resided here, Bishop Cant, Bishop Gillan, Bishop Keith ; and who it is that fills the see of Edinburgh just now, however unworthily, I need not say. Suffice it to observe, that since Bishops may have spiritual jurisdiction, and so both presbyters and people be bound to submit to them as their rulers, though they have not legal authority from the supreme power, if the Church of England was a pure and sound Church *before* the Revolution, which you cannot deny, ours could not be an impure one after that period ; because she continued to maintain the same principles after she lost the countenance of the civil magistrate, which the Church of England held before the arrival of the Prince of Orange, when you must admit she was a true and orthodox part of Christ's Mystical Body.

The sum of what I have said on this head is this, That since all the Bishops in the world preached, administered sacraments, and governed their respective dioceses for more than 300 years, and in short were universally acknowledged to be *lawful* Bishops, and to have *spiritual jurisdiction* over their flocks, although they acted in direct opposition to the supreme civil power, the Scots Bishops could not lose their spiritual authority over the people of this country, merely by being deprived of the countenance of the civil magistrate at the Revolution ; but, as they have held from that period downwards, and still do hold, the same orthodox faith as the Church of England, and have preserved the Episcopal succession regularly to this day ; therefore they all along have been, and now are, as *lawful* Bishops in the ecclesiastical sense of the word, as any in the world : Consequently they must have Divine authority for the exercise of their sacred ministry, as much as any other Bishops either in England or Ireland. So some of your clergy have of late acknowledged to me, and these neither the weakest nor the worst men ; and the belief of it among your laity is confirmed, by the constant application which has been, from time to time, made to our Bishops for the holy ordinance of confirmation by those of your communion. Yet, my brethren,

thren, is it not a fact, that you officiate without the authority of these lawful Bishops? and is not that a dreadful consideration? Is it possible that God, who is a God of order, not of confusion, can authorise the Bishop of Edinburgh, for example, to be the supreme governor in this diocese, and at the same time give the inferior clergy liberty to act in opposition to him? Surely not. If God is true, both cannot have his authority. But that the *Bishop* is authorised by God, if the succession in this country is preserved, all sensible Episcopalians must confess; and is not the conclusion lamentable? Think of it for God's sake, and now at last come over to the Church from which you have been too long estranged. Every day you repeat the Litany, you pray to God to deliver you from schism, which proves it to be a sin, otherwise your prayer would be a mockery of Heaven, of which you are incapable. Now schism, you know, is a separation from any pure part of the Church of God, when no sinful term of communion is required. And by our Church no sinful term is required; nor is there any obstacle to hinder you from acknowledging the spiritual authority of her governors. On the contrary, by our praying for his Majesty, the only shadow of an argument that was against us, is now removed. And as you are in full communion with the Church of England, and were you in that country, would think yourselves obliged to communicate with the Bishop of the diocese wherein you happened to live; therefore, however mercifully God may deal with conscientious dissenters, who believe it unlawful to join in communion with a Bishop, you, who see no just cause for withdrawing from it, must think *them* in a state of schism. Now, if it be schism in *England*, to separate from the communion of the lawful Bishop of the diocese, when he requires no sinful term of compliance, must not a separation from the communion of the lawful Bishop of the diocese be schism in *Scotland*, when no sinful term is required by him? Surely what is sinful, or what you would think wrong on the one side of the Tweed, cannot be consistent with Church unity, nor be innocent upon the other, all material circumstances being the same.

Consider this also, my Reverend and Honourable Friends, and do not persist in the daily practice of schism, when you are daily praying against it; for that will be a most tremendous piece of business, because, as I have already said, a most solemn affront to Almighty God.

Farther, consider that mere ordination does not make a  


---

 clergyman



clergyman the pastor of a congregation ; for the ordination-office tells you, that he must be *lawfully appointed thereunto*. Even the patron's presentation gives only right to the *stipend*, but forms no *relation* between the clergyman and the people. *That*, you know, is done by the *Episcopal authority*, or by institution and collation from the Bishop of the diocese, who is not only the principal, but, properly speaking, the *sole* pastor of the people in it: For, it is part of *his* authority which is communicated to the several presbyters, and to him they are accountable for the exercise of it. It is the Bishop of the diocese, therefore, and no other, who gives, or can give the inferior clergy power to feed the flock of Christ, and who makes them overseers of their respective congregations. " So you know," says the apostolical St Ignatius, " without *the Bishop* it is not lawful to baptise, nor to celebrate the feast of love," that is, the Holy Eucharist. Epistle to the Romans. And the 32d Apostolical canon, forbid, " presbyters and deacons to do any thing without the knowledge of the *Bishop*; because " with him the people of God are entrusted, and of him " an account of their souls will be demanded."

Now, my Brethren of the Clergy, forgive me, if I beg to know from what Bishop you have a pastoral relation to your flocks? It is obvious from what has been already said in this letter, that no Bishop in the world but one, has a right to form that relation; and to him, none of you as yet have ever applied; which is and ought to be for a lamentation. Your people I know are in the place of patrons; and have by their call given you a right to draw the emoluments of your several congregations; but the laity have no *spiritual* authority, and therefore cannot empower you to give the household of God their meat in due season. The power you have assumed, therefore, is, I suspect, imperfect, or rather usurped, (forgive the expression, since I know none better), and not valid, because not derived from lawful authority.

Think of this, my friends, without delay, and go no longer on in divisive measures, because they can yield no comfort either to yourselves or people. An essential *something* is wanting to make your ministrations effectual, which neither you nor your flock can furnish, as you must be sensible from what has been already said. *That defect* I am ready to supply, whenever you call for it in a proper manner. And let not the dread of being cramped in your ministrations, or debarred the use of your favourite liturgy, prevent



prevent your application ; for I faithfully assure you, that there is no cause for any apprehension on that head. Malice I know has reported, and the report I believe has been carried to a worthy English Prelate, that the Scotch Bishops are enemies to the liturgy of the Church of England : But the father of lies himself never invented a greater falsehood : for we believe the English Common Prayer Book to be the best composed liturgy at this day in the world. And it cannot be unknown to you, that we constantly use the morning and evening service of it, and the offices for baptism, confirmation, matrimony, &c. as occasion offers. 'Tis true, we prefer the Scotch communion-office, partly perhaps because it is Scotch, and was authorised by good King Charles I. and partly because we think it contains a more express invocation of the Holy Spirit on the Sacramental elements : but preference to it was never enjoined by the Bishops of this Church, but barely recommended ; the promiscuous use both of the English and Scotch being at all times allowed according to every clergyman's good pleasure. And I am certain, that the present Bishops have no intention to revoke that indulgence. On the contrary, we are ready to testify our union and communion with the Church of England as a Sister Church, by receiving the Holy Eucharist from the hands of her Bishops or Priests, as Providence shall give us opportunity ; and at all times will give the Church of England the right hand of fellowship, on account of the lustre of her numbers, and the still greater lustre of her many learned and able divines, both Bishops and Presbyters, who ever since the revival of literature have been, as they still are, the bulwark of the Reformation, the ornaments of their profession, and lights in the world. And more than this cannot be reasonably desired. Of the English liturgy, therefore, you shall have the full use ; and as a further inducement to the blessed work of peace, you may rest assured that I shall be happy to receive you upon the easiest terms. For I can with truth and a good conscience say, that I seek not *yours*, but *you* ; nor do I seek *you* for my own sake ; I mean from a lust of power, or the ambitious desire of appearing at the head of a numerous body of Presbyters. On the contrary, knowing that the less my charge, the less my account will be ; ~~and the less~~ could we in a state of separation as effectually promote the great work we are engaged in, as united, I had rather have few than many Clergymen under me.

B

But

But as I am satisfied that Episcopacy, which I believe to be a Divine institution, will never prosper, nor what I think to be the true religion will ever flourish in Scotland, while your and our society ~~is~~ <sup>are</sup> separate, I therefore ardently wish for a happy union. And as it is your duty, my brethren, as well as mine, to do every thing in your power to heal the sores of the daughter of God's people, I conjure you to concur with me in that excellent and charitable work. She hath long been wounded in the house of her friends, and forsaken, alas ! by too many of her own household ; and therefore, as she has need both of relief and comfort, so I hope the time of administering both is come. If you concur with me, the time is certainly come ; because nothing but your submission to lawful, and I trust I may truly say to *gentle*, authority, is wanting to effectuate this desirable and pious purpose. Let me therefore entreat you, in the bowels of Jesus Christ, to do your parts, as I am ready to do mine ; that so we may, in the language of the Psalmist, take sweet counsel together, and walk to the House of God as friends. Reflect, I beseech you, upon the truth which has been already established in this letter, that bare *ordination* does not make you pastors of your congregations ; nor the call of your people form any spiritual relation between you and them ; and of consequence, that not being *lawfully* appointed as the Church directs, you act in opposition to her authority. What follows I leave yourselves to add. Consider, farther, what a disagreeable situation you are reduced to with respect to the young people of your congregations : For though I am most willing to extend, as wide as duty will permit, the benefits and advantages of Episcopacy ; yet how can I, in consistency with Church-discipline and my own principles, dispense the sacred rite of Confirmation to the flock of that Clergyman who refuses to acknowledge me as his Bishop ? It is evident I cannot do it. Now, to you, my brethren, the want of this holy ordinance ought to be a lamentable consideration ; and I think it must give you great uneasiness, if you decline any reasonable terms to obtain it. And therefore I earnestly entreat, that you ~~would~~ <sup>will</sup> seriously reflect, and duly weigh what should be done to avert this calamity, and relieve yourselves and congregations, and me, in some measure, from circumstances so distressing ; for I wish to do you all the good in my power : but I must not, either to please myself or you, sacrifice the principles of the Christian Church.

Consider, moreover, that, by continuing the opposition, you will make yourselves accountable to God for all the unhappy

happy consequences and mischiefs which Church-divisions never fail to produce. Hear, in particular, what your friend, the elegant and spirited Doctor Stanhope, writes on this subject: "By the Apostles urging the edification of the  
 " body of Christ, in faith and love, as the great end of  
 " the Christian ministry, Clergymen may learn, says that  
 " great Divine, that they are highly blameable, if by their  
 " means any heresies or schisms get ground: if they do not  
 " faithfully warn against those things; if they do not detect the artifices of those who lie in wait to deceive; if  
 " they do not expose the error, the sinfulness, the *infinite*  
 " danger, both public and private, of those vile latitudinarian principles, which would not only break down the  
 " walls, but root up the *foundation* of this spiritual building. In short, if they do not set forth the *wickedness* of  
 " all wilful and needless, and the *misery* of all judicial and  
 " deserved separation from the Church of Christ, with all  
 " the aggravating circumstances so warmly and so frequently inculcated in Holy Scripture. For where, in  
 " truth, do we find *any one sin* more expressly forbidden,  
 " more severely threatened, or represented as more *fatal*  
 " and *damnable*, than those of *schism or heresy*? where any  
 " duty more plainly taught, more authoritatively commanded, or more zealously prayed for, than those of  
 " unity, peace, and love, in all the several members of this  
 " Spiritual Body?" I have quoted these paragraphs from Dr Stanhope, not only because he is an eminent and learned Divine, and his writings a standard for good Church-principles, as well as of the English language; but because he is one of your own communion, and flourished since the Revolution; and therefore may be supposed to have more weight with you than any thing I have said, or can say, upon this subject. Consult too, what Dr Scot, another Revolution Clergyman, hath said on the necessity of unity in the communion of the Church, Christian Life, vol. 3. chap. 7. sect. 9. and of the Edinburgh edition, pages 245 and 246; and from him you will learn, that whosoever separates from any *pure part* of the Christian Church, cuts himself off from the communion of the *Catholic* Church. And as the Episcopal Church in Scotland has been proved to be a *pure part* of Christ's Church, the conclusion I will not draw, but leave it to your serious consideration. See also what the great and learned Dr Barrow hath wrote on this subject, in his Treatise of the Unity of the Church, and the pious and learned Bishop Pearson, in his exposition of the 9th article of the Creed, the Holy Catholic Church.

But why do I mention particular Divines? Consider how much and how deeply the unity of the Church engaged our Blessed Saviour's thoughts, even in the last and most awful moments of his life, when he was about to shed his blood for mankind! Holy Father, keep through thy own name those whom thou hast given me, said our Gracious Lord just before he went out to the fatal garden of Gethsemane, that they may be *one*, even as we are. And again, Neither pray I for these alone, but for *them also who shall believe in me through their word, that they all may be one*, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that *they may be one* in us; that *the world may believe that thou hast sent me*. The same petition our Divine Master puts up twice more in the course of a few sentences, John, xvii. 11. 20. 21. 22.; and surely a subject which employed so much of Christ's thoughts at *any time of his life*, but especially, I say, in his *last moments*, must be of *great importance*, whatever a careless world may imagine; and ought to excite the attention, and the practice of it be the study, of every serious Christian, but especially Clergymen. Indeed, unity among our Blessed Lord's followers is so necessary, that he makes it, you see, *one proof of his Divine mission*; and fairly insinuates, that, if his disciples should divide and separate into sects and factions, instead of forming *one body*, the *world*, that is, *many in the world*, would not believe that God had sent him. Not that our Blessed Saviour intended by these words, to put the truth of his religion upon the unity of his followers; for he well knew that the completion of Scripture prophecies, and the miracles wrought by himself and his Apostles, would establish the doctrines he taught, and force conviction upon all sensible and unprejudiced persons, without regard either to the faith or practice of professing Christians. But he foresaw that divisions and dissensions among his disciples would in all ages of the Church have this bad effect, that they would cause *many* thoughtless people to overlook the arguments in proof of his divinity, and hastily to conclude, that, since he had not accomplished what he had so much at heart, the preservation of his Church in unity, he was either *unable*, or wanted *wisdom*, to bring that event about: and so, in either case, could not be a divine person, as he pretended to be: for God's power, argue those unbelievers, none can withstand, and his purposes nothing can disappoint. In this manner, I say, do our unhappy divisions operate upon the minds of thoughtless and inconsiderate men, to the prejudice of our common Christianity; and even cause the name of our Blessed



fed Lord himself to be blasphemed, as if he had been an imposter, and had not been sent by God. Wherefore, as we would not wish to harden the hearts of unbelievers against Christ's doctrine, nor cause himself to be reproached as a deceiver, let us all resolve from henceforth to lay aside every weight, and the sin which so easily besets us, and keeps us separate, of whatever nature it may be; let us remove every obstacle, whether arising from prejudice or worldly interest, which may obstruct an happy agreement, and for the future be determined to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

I am aware that our Blessed Saviour's prayer for the unity of the Church, which I have here insisted on, is primarily to be understood of unity of heart and affection. And accordingly so I have explained it in a sermon upon that subject: And I agree with the learned Principal Campbell, that the word *schism*, as used in the New Testament, has always a reference to an alienation of the heart; and that part, though not the whole of the evil and guilt of schism in the ecclesiastical sense of the word, arises from the effect it has in producing strife and contention, and consequently in estranging the affections of fellow-Christians from one another, I say part, though not the whole guilt; for schism, or a causeless division of the Church, is faulty, as it is a breach of order, as it is a contempt of lawful authority, and deforms the mystical body of Christ, which is the beauty of holiness, by rending it in pieces. But I cannot help differing from that sensible and eminent scholar, when he insinuates, that schism and heresy in the ecclesiastical, and I may add, very ancient sense of the words, (as signifying, to wit, a causeless separation from the Church, or breach of communion in it, and errors in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, when persisted in, after admonition), are not, by plain implication at least, if not in direct terms, prohibited in Holy Scripture; but are innocent and harmless things, provided that they are embraced sincerely, and without hatred and ill-will. For thus I understand the following words in Dr Campbell's Dissertation on Heresy, page 433-4. "How much soever  
 " of a schismatical or heretical spirit, in the Apostolic sense  
 " of these terms, may have contributed to the formation  
 " of different sects into which the Christian world is at present divided; no person who, in the spirit of candour  
 " and charity, adheres to that which, to the best of his  
 " judgement is right, though in this opinion he should be  
 " mistaken,



“ mistaken, is in the scriptural sense either schismatic or heretic. And that he, on the contrary, whatever sect he belongs to, is more intitled to these odious appellations who is most apt to throw the imputation upon others.” That love is the cement wherewith all Christians ought to be united, is most certain; and that every deviation from that sacred bond, even in the heart, is sinful, and may not improperly be termed schismatical, I have no doubt. But surely, if an internal alienation of affection, even when it does not manifest itself by an actual separation of communion, is sinful, and deservedly styled schismatical; such a violation of the great bond of charity as discovers itself by an open division and breach in the Church of God must, *a fortiori*, be more criminal, and more justly stigmatized with the odious epithet of schism, as the actual theft of one’s goods is more sinful, because more mischievous, than a plan formed to steal, but not carried into execution. The consequence is, that if a mental alienation of affection is forbidden in Scripture, much more must schism in the ecclesiastical sense of the word, by implication be forbidden. For though Dr Campbell seems to suppose, that one may separate from the Church in the spirit of candour and charity, I will venture to affirm, without fear of contradiction, that in no age or country was a schism ever formed, which at first was not raised upon the ruins of love and peace: and therefore, if ever men’s passions so subside that they can differ in candour and charity from their Christian brethren, it must be after a very long time; and I fear is the lot only of a few very sensible, mild, and benevolent spirits, like Dr Campbell, or the effect of vile latitudinarian principles, and disregard to all religion, which destroys Christian zeal entirely, and makes men regardless what system of Christianity prospers in the world.

That men ought to differ in charity, I am perfectly convinced; but that ever the communion of the Church was divided without a breach of that bond of perfectness, I suspect is a mistake; and therefore whether the word σχισμα, schism, be applied in Holy Scripture to an actual separation of communion or not, is not material; because it may be owing to this cause, that no schism, in the ecclesiastical sense of the word, happened in the Church till after the Apostolical Epistles were all written, (such as separated from the common communion before that period, having not rested there, but proceeded to apostacy;) but still it is clear, that splitting into factions, or dividing the

the Church causelessly, always arises either from pride, contempt of lawful authority, or erroneous tenets; and, being a greater violation of the great law of love, than a mere mental alienation of affection, must, as I have said, be necessarily prohibited, and included in the word *σχίσμα*, or schism, where-ever that is forbidden as a breach of Christian charity. As to the word *διχοστασία*, division, though Dr Campbell seems to suppose that it is not used in Scripture to signify actual separations of communion, which may be true, for the reason already assigned, that none such took place in the Church at the time St Paul wrote; yet as the Apostle foresaw, that in after times such kind of schisms would be formed among Christians, plain it is, that when he desires the Romans to mark them who cause *divisions*, *διχοστασίας*, and avoid them, he may very properly be understood to condemn all causeless separations, of whatsoever nature, and consequently schism in the ecclesiastical sense of the word, as one of the worst and most mischievous species of divisions. Just so, when in his Epistle to the Hebrews, x. 25. he forbids the Christian Jews to neglect the assembling of themselves together, as the manner of some is; though that text is commonly supposed to warn against the neglect of public worship and apostacy only, it may also be extended to the prohibition of separate communions, and to enjoin the preservation of unity in the bond of peace. Indeed, where-ever concord is recommended, and dissention is condemned in the New Testament, there all separations of communion, when no sinful terms are required, must be supposed to be condemned also, particularly in the text so much dwelt upon, John, xvii. 20. 21. where Christ earnestly prays that his Church may be one, even as he and his Father is one, that the world may believe that God has sent him, unity of communion must, I apprehend, be included in the unity he there prays for, because it is more *visible*, and therefore, to the generality of men, most of whom are thoughtless and inconsiderate, a more striking proof, if possible, of Christ's mission from heaven, than internal love ~~can afford to any other hope~~; for the inward affection may be counterfeited where it is not real, and may be concealed for a long time where it exists;—whereas, if men separate into factions, and divide the communion of the Church, it must be visible to the most inconsiderate: for conventicles cannot be concealed, nor different congregations held, without being discerned by all around, because these things cannot be done in a corner.

corner. And as different communions appear to be different churches, they give the enemies of religion opportunities to blaspheme our Lord, and say, that he is either unable, or knows not how to chuse the proper means for preserving his followers in unity, and so cannot be a Divine person, as already observed.

Farther, as our Blessed Saviour compares his Church to a house, a family, a city, a kingdom, a body, a building, to all which, a division or separation of parts is visibly pernicious, and very often fatal; it is clear, that he as plainly forbids causeless separations from it, as if he had discharged that crime in the strongest and most express terms.

In like manner as to Heresy in the ecclesiastical sense of the word, as the Divine Father and his Blessed Son are united in mind and sentiment as well as in love, and our Lord prays, that his Church may be *one*, as he and his Father are one, it follows clearly, that all his followers ought to agree in the fundamental articles of our holy faith. This Dr Campbell seems to allow: for, speaking of the primitive Church, he says, p. 419. "It cannot be denied, " that a certain uniformity, or a declared assent to the great " articles of the Christian profession, was necessary in every " one, in order to his being admitted to or kept in the communion of the Church."—And I agree with the Doctor, that the terms at first were few, and are now too much multiplied in every part of the Christian world. But since the learned Principal grants, that a declared assent to the great articles of the Christian profession was in primitive times necessary, ought he not to grant also, that they are necessary still? and that they who refuse to declare that assent now, and separate from the Church rather than believe these articles, and persist therein, are both heretics and schismatics? Surely. For St John enjoins us, not to bid them God speed who bring not with them Christ's doctrine, nor to receive them into our houses: otherwise he tells us, that we become partakers of their evil deeds, 2 John, v. 10. 11. And we are elsewhere commanded, to be sound in the faith, and to speak the things which concern sound doctrine: and, in short, to *contend earnestly* for the faith delivered unto the Saints, Jude. Nay, after all that the learned Principal hath said, it appears to me evident that the word *αιρεσεις*, heresies, as used by St Peter, 2 Ep. 2. ch. v. 1. is meant of erroneous doctrines. For though the words *αρνημενοι* and *επαγοντες* are in the nominative plural, and agree with *Ψευδοδιδασκαλοι*, not with *αιρεσεις*, yet plain it is that these false

false teachers denied the Lord that bought them, and there can be no doubt, but that they would endeavour to persuade their followers to deny him also. And if so, that was one of the heresies which they taught, and, together with other erroneous doctrines, is probably, I think I may say is certainly, comprehended under the phrase *αἰρεσεις ἀπωλειαι*, destructive heresies. This Doctor Campbell seems to acknowledge; for he admits that they who are said to bring in the heresies there spoken of, will “entertain destructive principles, and disseminate them among their votaries,” p. 435. And what, I pray, is a destructive principle, but a heresy?

Upon the whole: Since Christians are commanded in holy scripture, to be sound in the faith, to contend earnestly for it, and not to depart therefrom; it is beyond dispute manifest, that it must be sinful to entertain doctrines which are inconsistent with the great articles of our holy profession. And if so, what signifies it by what name the entertaining such doctrines be called? or whether the word *Heresy* be applied to them or not in holy writ? The thing, or crime, of holding damnable principles, is condemned; and by consequence, heresy, in the ecclesiastical sense of that word, is condemned also. Yet, says Dr Campbell, “no person who in the spirit of candour and charity adheres to that sect which to the best of his judgement is right, though in this opinion he may happen to be mistaken, is in the scriptural sense either schismatic or heretic.”—But has not the contrary been just now proved? and does not this resolve all right and wrong with respect to religious opinions, into sincerity, provided that a man has calm passions, and can differ from the Church without hating those he differs from? If it be true, that schism and heresy, in the ecclesiastical and common and ordinary acceptance of these words, are forbidden in scripture, (and if the latter is not forbidden, ~~this~~ foolish and absurd, as well as impious opinion would be true, that men are not obliged to believe what God has revealed to them), they cannot be innocent, however sincerely men may adhere to their sect; because the nature of things cannot be altered by our sincerity or insincerity. 'Tis true, it makes a great difference as to the guilt, whether a man means well, and acts from an erroneous conscience, or against the convictions of his own mind. But still, if his ignorance is not invincible, he may be very criminal even in the former case; and with respect



to society it is much the same, from what motive the person acts. For the poison of evil principles, for example, is the same in its own nature, and may be as dangerous to the souls of other men, when propagated sincerely, as when diffeminated out of malice. Nay, when dangerous doctrines are inculcated by men otherwise sober, and honest, and good natured, like our late countryman Mr David Hume, they are in greater danger of spreading farther, and being more greedily sucked in, and consequently of doing more hurt, than when they are propagated by profligate, insincere, and notoriously wicked men; and therefore there is at least as great, or rather greater need to stem the torrent in the one case than in the other. Indeed were not this the case, I should hardly at this time, when my eyes forbid me either to write or read, have taken the trouble to appear in print against my old acquaintance Dr Campbell. But as I know the Doctor to have a cool head, and gentle temper, and to be a man of consummate learning, great natural ability, and pure in his morals; and being persuaded that what he has said of heresy and schism, if not combated in time, would have the effect to cause these vices, which are very dangerous to the Church of God, to be lightly thought of, or even be reckoned perfectly innocent; I therefore thought it my duty to bear my testimony against the Doctor's opinion, tho' I have no doubt but he holds it with great sincerity, and as much in the spirit of candour and charity as is possible. But however sincere Dr Campbell may be, he cannot be more so than was St Paul, when he laid waste the Church of God: for he declared, that he then lived in all good conscience, and verily believed that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus; and yet when he became a Christian, he acknowledged that he was a blasphemer, a persecutor, and injurious. A prejudicated opinion, that because the law of Moses was from God, therefore the ceremonial, as well as moral part of it, was to be perpetual, warped that great apostle's mind, and prevented him from examining as he ought into the evidence for the truth of Christianity: And as the ablest men are liable to the like infirmity, other prejudices, such as these,—that there is no necessity for a divine mission to preach the gospel, or at least, not for an uninterrupted mission from the apostles, (see Dr Campbell's sermon before the synod of Aberdeen, Anno 1771. p. 119.); and that schism and heresy, in the modern sense of these words, if embraced sincerely and in the spirit of charity, are not sinful,



ful, hoodwink, I suspect, the learned Principal's eyes, and prevent him, and many other able and worthy men of his persuasion from becoming members of the Church, to which, but for these mistakes, they would be great ornaments, and in it burning and shining lights.

But to return from this, I hope, not an improper digression. Let me again intreat you, Gentlemen, to think seriously of what I have said, and to concur in healing our unhappy differences. To encourage you to this good work, you may rest assured, that all that is past shall be buried in oblivion. May God enable you by his grace to comply with this necessary request, that so you may be instrumental in promoting his glory, and the good of his long-distressed Church. So prays,

Your affectionate humble servant,

WM ABERNETHY DRUMMOND.

EDINBURGH, 20th April 1789.

### P O S T S C R I P T.

**F**AME reports, that some of your body, and especially of my Brethren of the Clergy, are anxious to be exempted by parliament from the jurisdiction of the Scots Bishops; and to have a Bishop consecrated for you, either by the Archbishop of Canterbury or York, or to be taken under the inspection of some of the English Bishops. I am not however willing to believe this story, for several reasons. But whether true or false, there is no probability that Parliament will, to oblige you, either intringe the articles of Union, or offend the established Clergy; who, though they patiently acquiesce in the exercise of our ministry, because they know we are the rightful successors of the Bishops ejected at the Revolution, and so have both a natural and divine right to instruct and govern those who commit themselves to our care, will never suffer the introduction of a new Episcopacy, or that Bishops from England be obtruded on them. Besides, I have such confidence in the good sense and good principles of both the Metropolitans, that I am persuaded neither of them will be instrumental in erecting altar against altar, and disturbing the peace of the Church in this country; but, on the contrary, will do what they can to preserve the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace here, and in every place. Nay, I flatter myself, that these excellent Prelates will hereafter discourage even the ordination of Presbyters for Scotland; because, now that the Scotch Bishops have complied with Government, they must be satisfied that there is no reason, either religious or political, that can justify such a measure. As we claim no temporal jurisdiction, nor any legal title to our dioceses, so we wish

D

not

not to have, nor ever can obtain, any legal authority over you ; and therefore, if your consciences do not compel you to submit to our authority, the law of the country never will : the consequence of which is, that as to the matter of obedience, you will always remain free, and be your own masters. This however is certain, that since there is in Scotland a regular Episcopacy, you must either be members of the Church of Scotland, or of no Church. For to pretend that persons living in this country can be subject to the authority of the Church of England, is as absurd as to maintain, that the inhabitants of Edinburgh are citizens of London ~~and~~ York, and obliged to obey the magistrates of those cities. The late Bishop of London, when applied to by an Episcopal congregation in Dundee to take them under his inspection, very properly gave for answer, that he had never heard that Dundee was in the diocese of London. And so every Bishop in England, I am persuaded, would reply at this time, if the like request were made by you. Be contented, therefore, Gentlemen, with your lot ; and, for the peace of our Jerusalem, acknowledge those who ought to have the rule over you : for be assured, no sinful term of communion shall be required of you, nor any hardship imposed upon you ; nor shall the Episcopal authority ever be employed to alter your mode of worship.

Remember, my Brethren of the Clergy, that you promised in the face of the Congregation, when you were admitted into holy orders, nay, you, to all intents and purposes, *vowed to God*, to maintain, as much as in you lies, quietness, peace, and love among all Christian people. And can you believe that vow to be fulfilled, merely by not exciting quarrels in private families ? Surely not. Were any of you to be instrumental in setting kingdom against kingdom, or even raising tumults in your own country, would not that be a direct violation of your promise ? It is past dispute it would. And if union and harmony be as necessary in the Church of God and kingdom of Christ, as in political states, which you cannot deny, will you not, by continuing altar against altar, now that all cause of difference is, by our compliance with Government, done away, as evidently break your vow, as in the other case ? Most undoubtedly you will. Because, by refusing to obey them who ought to have the rule over you, and to become members of a regular Episcopal Church, you will still keep up a division among us, encourage a factious spirit among your Brethren, and rend the mystical body of Christ asunder. Remember also, that upon the same solemn occasion, you promised reverently to  
obey

obey your Ordinary, or Bishop, and other chief Ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you, following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting yourselves to their godly judgments. Now does not this suppose, that every Episcopal Clergyman ought to have a Bishop over him? and of consequence, that you, my Brethren, ought to be under Episcopal jurisdiction? Yet, in fact, you are not. Now, is this a state consistent with the above solemn obligations which all Episcopal Clergymen come under at their ordination? or is it a state which any worthy Clergyman of good principles would wish to be in? And if not, can it be innocent to continue in it, when you can so easily get out of it? Think of this seriously, and may God give you understanding in all things. Again, my honoured Brethren of the Laity, as you are patrons to your congregations, and have it in your power to prevail on your Clergy to submit to every thing that is reasonable, can you employ your influence to better purpose, than in endeavouring to reconcile them to your mother Church, in which many of you were born and baptized, and to which all of your predecessors once belonged? Remember that there is a blessing promised to the peace-makers, and strive, I beseech you, by promoting union, to obtain that blessing. Nothing surely is more desirable for Christians, than to take sweet counsel together, and to walk to the house of God as friends. And since you and we acknowledge one Lord, hold one faith, and have received one baptism, should we not be under the same government, and partake also of one Eucharist, and with one mouth glorify our Maker by our prayers and praises, and so be united in the mystical body of Christ by those joints and bands which St Paul so earnestly recommends? Indeed, my Brethren, you should, if I am not deceived, promote this union, that your Clergy may have regular authority to minister amongst you, which at present I suspect they have not. In every Episcopal church, and particularly in England, after the patron has presented to the living, the Bishop, you know, collates the clergyman to his charge, forms the pastoral relation between him and the people, and thereby authorises him to feed the flock of God, and to give them their meat in due season. Now, my Brethren, no Bishop has conveyed this authority to your Clergy. And yet St Paul seems to think it necessary. For he tells the elders of the church of Ephesus, that the *Holy Ghost* had made them overseers, Acts xx.

28. which plainly implies, that the right of exercising spiritual functions in any congregation is derived from God, Now, my Brethren, you have too much good sense, and, I'm persuaded, too much religion, to believe, that your election of a Clergyman can convey any spiritual authority, and therefore you will readily believe that it must be derived through the medium of the Bishop. Consider this, and may God direct you to what is right. Further, to convince you of the necessity of an union with the Scotch Episcopal Church, consider that our Blessed Saviour came into the world, not barely to reveal a system of articles to be believed by his followers, and to gather out of the world a peculiar people to himself, zealous of good works, but to make all the professors of his doctrine *one body or society*, by uniting them into *one visible communion*, under visible Governors, who should watch for their souls. And accordingly the first Christians not only adhered to the apostles doctrine, but to their *fellowship or communion* also; and testified their adherence to them, by breaking of bread, or communicating in the Holy Eucharist with them, and by prayers, Acts, ch. ii. v. 46. And as the first Christians were thus instructed and governed by, and received the holy sacraments from the Apostles, and such as they appointed to officiate in holy things under them; so ought all Christians, in all ages of the Church, to be instructed and governed by, and to receive the holy sacrament from the Apostles *successors*, and such as they ordain; there being the same necessity for the performance of those duties, and for the preservation of peace and order in the Church of God in every age, as at the beginning. And this being evident, may it not be said of those who separate *now* from the rightful Governors of the diocesses wherein they live, as St John said of them who withdrew from the Apostles *then*:—They went out from us, because they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; the meaning of which I leave yourselves to explain. Consider these things, my Reverend and honoured Brethren, earnestly, as the Church directs on another occasion, and then I doubt not but that, by God's grace, you will see your error, and return speedily to a better mind; for the obtaining whereof we shall not cease to make our humble petitions to Almighty God, our heavenly Father.

T H E E N D.



Since these sheets came from the press, I have been informed, my Brethren, that you refuse to unite with the Scotch Episcopal Church, on these two grounds, *first*, That the Scotch communion office, by containing a prayer of invocation of the Holy Spirit, and of oblation, makes such an approach to Popery, that you think it unlawful to communicate by it : And, *secondly*, That you are a part of the Church of England, and consequently a *separate* society, which has no occasion to unite itself with the Episcopal Church in this kingdom.

As to the first, That there is indeed a prayer of oblation and invocation in the Scotch communion-office, cannot be denied ; and I trust, it shall appear, that it is not the worse on that account, but the better. However, I mean not to enter far into a proof of that point, not only because it would enlarge this little pamphlet much beyond the bounds which I have prescribed to it, but chiefly because it is not necessary ; it being sufficient for my purpose to shew, that these, and the other usages complained of, are not *sinful*, and so can furnish no just handle for separating from the communion of this Church. Now, that they are not *unlawful*, is plain from this consideration, that they are *all* clearly and distinctly in the *first* Liturgy of King Edward VI. which was drawn up, among other worthy and great Divines, by Archbishop Cranmer, and Bishop Ridley, martyrs and by Dr John Taylor, and Dr Richard Cox, confessors for the doctrines of the Church of England, in the Popish Queen Mary's days. And being revised and approved of by the Archbishops and Bishops and Clergy of both provinces of Canterbury and York, was afterwards confirmed by the Lords Spiritual, the first of the Three Estates of Parliament, with the concurrence of the Lords Temporal, and Commons, in Parliament assembled, and sanctioned by the King *anno* 1548 : As you may learn from your brother, the Rev. Mr Charles Wheatly's Appendix to the Introductory discourse to his excellent rational illustration of the Book of Common Prayer. And it deserves to be remarked, that as the committee of Divines, which drew up that pious form, was appointed to have an eye and respect, as well to *the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by the Scripture*, as to *the usage of the Primitive Church* ; so, when it was composed, the King and Lords Spiritual, &c. style it a *godly* order, concluded with one uniform agreement, "*by the aid of the Holy Ghost* : " words so strong and remarkable, that I am persuaded the like were never used, of any other liturgy, by any other Parliament. And yet though remarkably strong, they were not more strong than true. For since the word of God assures us, that the Holy

Spirit helpeth our infirmities, and maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered; that is, assists good Christians in their private devotions, there can be no doubt, but that when so many worthy and pious Clergymen were employed in composing a public form of devotion for the most solemn institution of our holy religion, they would be equally assisted by the same Divine Spirit. And that being so, it is impossible that the usages you complain of, (which were *all* in that liturgy, as may be yet seen, upon the bare inspection of it), can be reckoned sinful, without blasphemy. And here I might stop. But to establish this point a little more, and to take away all ground of quarrel from them that seek occasion, I add farther, that though the Church of England left them out of her communion-office, at the instigation of Calvin, Peter Martyr, and Bucer, foreign Presbyterians, from a pious hope of strengthening the Reformation, by reconciling the Calvinistic and other churches abroad to Episcopal government, which the Church of England thought divine; yet so far were the compilers of King Edward's first liturgy from thinking it unlawful on account of the usages, or of altering their opinion of it, when these were left out; that on the contrary, the Lords Spiritual, and other branches of Parliament, by that very act which made those changes, still call "the first liturgy, a *godly order, agreeable to the word of God and the Primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation, and profitable to the estate of this realm.*" Nay, they accuse those people, (who absented from their parish-churches because of the usages), of "following their own *sensuality, and living either without knowledge, or due fear of God;*" and call their crime, in so abstaining, a wilful and damnable sin. And, moreover, they say, that those peoples doubts about the usages, arose rather from the "curiosity of the ministers, and mistakers, (to wit; Bucer, Peter Martyr; &c.), than of any other *worthy cause.*" All which words are so plain that they need no comment; and they are sufficient, I apprehend, to convince any true member of the Church of England, that the usages you complain of, afford no good reason for refusing to communicate with the Episcopal Church of Scotland. For surely, if in the judgement of all the Bishops of England, it was so great a crime in the Puritans to refuse communion with them in King Edward's time on account of the usages, the sin can be no less in those who separate, because of them, from our church in these days: as it will not, I presume, be

be said, that what is sinful on the south side of the Tweed, becomes innocent when practised on the north. But perhaps you'll tell me, that the act of parliament which established the second liturgy of King Edward VI. and spoke so highly of his first communion-office, was repealed by his sister Queen Mary. The fact I acknowledge; but it is also true, that the repealing act, so far as concerned the Common Prayer Book, was itself repealed by her successor Queen Elizabeth, as you may see in the act of uniformity set forth by that Princess, and prefixed to your Prayer Books. Consequently, the preamble of that act which bestowed so high an encomium on the first liturgy of King Edward, was restored by Queen Elizabeth, and is in force at this day; which made Mr Boyer say, in his *true account*, in answer to Hoadley's *plain account* of the Lord's Supper, p. 54, 55. that the doctrine of the Church of England, with respect to the sacrifice of the Christian Eucharist, is still the same as when the usages were practised by her. But be that as it will, certain it is, that the Church of England, though she thinks not the usages essential, yet hath by no public deed declared them errors, far less heresies; and that many of her greatest scholars and worthiest members, both bishops and presbyters, have defended and practised them in private, even after they were left out of her liturgy: such as, Archbishop Laud, Bishop Poynt, Bishop Andrews, the great Mr Mede, Dr Brevint, Mr Thorndike, Mr Scandaret, and the author of the whole Duty of Man, before the Revolution; and the learned Archbishop Wake, Bishop Bull, Mr Wheatley, Mr Bowyer, after that period. Besides, it has been unanswerably proved, by Dr Brett, Dr Hicks, Dr Wagstaff, your late brother Mr Johnson, and others, that the usages complained of were all practised in the pure and primitive Church of Christ, before the errors of Popery were thought of. Indeed, that this was so, the concurrent testimony of all the ancient liturgies clearly evince: for there is not one of them which has not a prayer of invocation and oblation, &c. and these disposed in the same manner as they are in the Scotch communion-office, except in the Romish missal, where the invocation is placed first, as (by copying too closely, though with a good intention, that office) it also was in Edward VIth's first liturgy. Now, as all the ancient liturgies agree in those usages, differing a little only in words, but the same in sense; and as this uniformity was not enjoined

by the authority of a general council, or an imperial edict, (for then the words of consecration, as well as the sense, would have been the same in all churches, as the Nicene creed is); hence it follows, that there was originally *one* traditional form left in all churches by the apostles or evangelists, their first founders, from which they were all copied. For as there were no written liturgies before the council of Nice, it is impossible that the liturgies of all churches could have so exactly agreed in substance, as we find they did, if there had not been a particular form appointed by divine authority, from which they were all copied. Agreeably to this, Archbishop Wake gives it as his opinion, " that those " prayers in which all the liturgies agree, in sense at least, " if not in words, it may reasonably be presumed, were " first prescribed in the same or like terms by the apostles " and evangelists." Preliminary discourse to his translation of the Apostolical Fathers.

Wherefore, seeing this is so, and a truth that cannot be denied, and seeing the departure from the first liturgy of King Edward hath not produced the intended good effect; let me exhort you, my Brethren, to hearken to the voice of your friend and brother, the judicious Mr Thorne-dike, on this subject, one of the great glories of the Reformation, who, in his Just Weights and Measures, chapter xxii. p. 159. thus writes: " And seeing the abating of the first form under Edward VI. hath wrought no effect, but to give them that desired it an appetite to root up the whole; what thanks can we render to God for escaping so great a danger, but by sticking firm to a rule that will stick firm to us, and carry us through any dispute in religion, and land us in the haven of a quiet conscience, what troubles soever we pass through, in maintaining that the reformation of the church will never be according to the rule *which it ought to follow, till it cleave to the Catholic Church of Christ.*" Or, if you will not be persuaded to adopt the Scotch communion-office, be at least contented with your own; and seek not, my Brethren, presumptuously to dictate to the governors of the church in the bosom of which you live: for surely that is too much; but study the things which make for peace, and continue no longer separate from a society which, after what has been said, you must be sensible, is a pure part of Christ's Catholic church, and to which the noble army of martyrs, had they been cotemporary, would



would have born ample testimony: A Society in short, with which if you refuse to communicate now, you must have excommunicated yourselves from all the churches of God in the world, during the first ages, and till after the Reformation, there not being *one* orthodox Christian church from the days of our blessed Saviour, till Luther and Calvin appeared, that I ever heard or read of, in which an invocation of the Spirit of God, and an oblation of the sacramental elements, and the other usages you complain of, were not practised. If I am mistaken, gentlemen, be pleased to point out the Church in which different practices prevailed, and I shall confess my error. But if you can find no such church, and I am persuaded you cannot, think seriously of what is here said; and if you persist obstinately in your resolution to continue separate, think of it with fear and trembling too: For, if the English communion-office in Edward VIth's first liturgy was a *godly* order, agreeable to the word of God and the Primitive Church, notwithstanding that it contained, besides the invocation and oblation, an express order for the mixture, and a prayer in direct terms for the faithful departed, it is impossible that the two former can contaminate our communion-office; and no others are in it. And if they who abstained from the Churches where these usages were practised in King Edward's days, followed their own sensuality, lived *without knowledge, and the due fear of God*, and sinned wilfully and damnably, as all the Bishops of England, and the King, Temporal Lords, and Commons, declared, by a law which is still in force, I leave you to judge how guilty they are who abstain from our Church, on account of her communion-office, which is conformable to all the liturgies that ever were used in the Christian world from the days of our blessed Saviour, until the Reformation. And with these words I conclude my answer to your first objection; and now proceed to your second, which, if possible, is more extraordinary than the other, because at the very first sight, it is directly contrary to Scripture, and the nature and constitution of the Christian Church.

The second objection is, That you are a part of the Church of England, and consequently a separate society, which has no occasion to unite with the Episcopal Church in this kingdom. Now, my Brethren, hath not our blessed Lord himself told us, that his *fold* was to be but *one*, as there is but one shepherd; and consequently that his Church was to be but *one* body or society, wherever dispersed throughout the world? And if so, does it not follow,  
that

that, in whatever country a regular Church holding the Catholic faith, and requiring no sinful terms of communion, exists, with it all Christians are obliged to communicate? Surely this is an undeniable consequence. And to be farther convinced of it, I refer you to your late worthy and learned brother Dr Scot, an eminent Divine of the Church of England, who, in his *Christian Life*, vol 3. (p. 245. & 6. of the Edinburgh edition), has discussed this point at full length, and clearly established it. Besides; if you are a part of the Church of England, you and your hearers must be subject to some one Bishop of the Church of England; yet you know that not one of them has jurisdiction in this country, by any law, either of church or state. Indeed, to maintain, that the Church of England has authority in Scotland, where a regular Church subsists, is to erect an empire within an empire, if ever it was done on earth: which is such a solecism in government, and so destructive of order and peace, as never can be countenanced by a God of order, and therefore will not, I trust, be longer defended by any, except such as are friends to anarchy and confusion. Did you ever read of any Episcopal presbyters and people except yourselves, who pretended to be members of a Church different from that wherein they lived, if it was a pure Church? If you did, be so kind as point them out to me: But if you know of none, and I verily believe you do not, think what strange prerogatives of exemption you assume. My Brethren, however lightly dissenters from the Episcopal Church may speak or write of schism, not only the Holy Scriptures, and the ancient Catholic Church, but the Church of England at this day, considers it as a very heinous crime: otherwise, as she petitions God against it, she would mock him by her prayers. The consequence is, that since you use the Church of England liturgy, and also pray against schism, you are obliged to regard it as a crime, and to avoid it. And since all are schismatics, in her judgement, who refuse to be present at her devotions, (See her 27th Canon), because her worship is lawful, and enjoined by competent authority, does it not follow, that if you refuse to join in the Scotch communion-office, which I have proved to be lawful, you also will be schismatics in her judgement? To me this inference is clear as light at noon-day; and I pray you, for God's sake, to think seriously of it. To say, that our office, because authorised by the Bishops *only*, has not competent authority, if a good argument, would justify a separation from the public worship, not only in the very first ages, but after liturgies came

came into use: For it is well known, that they had no other sanction for a considerable time, but that of the Bishops and Metropolitans, in their respective diocesses and provinces, as your Learned Brother Mr Bingham has clearly proved. Besides, if you continue separate from us, that you will be schismatics in the judgement of the Church of England, is clear also from her petition in the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church, wherein she begs of God to inspire the *universal Church* with the spirit of *truth, unity, and concord*: For this proves, of what importance she thinks unity and concord, as well as truth, to be; and that all Christians ought to be of one communion. In short, it proves, that clergy and laity are obliged, in their respective stations, to do every thing that is reasonable to promote peace and concord; that the Bishops ought to enjoin nothing which is contradictory to God's word; and that the inferior Clergy and people should unite with them in breaking of bread and prayers, when their religious offices are lawful, otherwise the petition has no meaning. Upon the whole, as the only part of our liturgy which you do, or indeed can object to, is approved of by an act of Parliament, as already observed, *the very authority* by which you exercise your functions in these kingdoms, it is evident, that if you persevere in your opposition to the government of this Church, you are not only schismatics in the judgement of the Church of England, but are self-condemned. May God hasten the time, when all the members of Christ's Church shall, with one heart and one voice, glorify and praise God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. *Amen.*





